REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12, 13 and 18-27 are all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7-10, 12, 18-20 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as

being anticipated by Abecassis (US 5,913,013). Applicants kindly request that the Examiner

reconsider this rejection in view of the following comments.

Claim 1 recites the features of an AV decoder for decoding the first AV transport packets

and <u>outputting AV data</u>; and an <u>AV encoder</u> for <u>encoding the AV data</u> and outputting second AV

transport packets.

Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose or suggest the above-

noted combination of features recited in claim 1.

Regarding Abecassis, Applicants note that Fig. 3A of this reference depicts a

conventional motion picture program in which the segments are arranged as a unique sequential

arrangement of frames (see col. 9, lines 16-18). In a variable content program adaptation of the

convention motion picture, the various scenes 302 of the program are, according to an evaluation

of the contents of the scenes, divided into appropriate segments 303 (see col. 9, lines 18-22). In

the example shown in Fig. 3A, segment 311, which begins at frame 4112, is described as

including frames depicting explicit bloodshed (see cell 319 of Fig. 3A; and col. 9, lines 27-29).

As explained in connection with Fig. 3B of Abecassis, in order to provide for the option

of editing out the above-noted explicit bloodshed, the program segment map includes an

additional segment definition 321, which begins at frame 4112, and the end of the additional

segment definition 321 is linked to a new transitional segment 322 (see col. 9, lines 32-38). In a similar manner, Fig. 3C of Abecassis includes additional segment definitions 331 and 332, which are used to accommodate graphic violence that is included in an additional segment 333 (see col. 9, lines 49-56).

Regarding the additional frames which result from the above-noted additional segments 322 and 333, Abecassis discloses that some frames will be non-sequentially placed in the variable content program (see Fig. 3D and col. 10, lines 4-13).

As noted above, claim 1 recites the features of an AV decoder for decoding the first AV transport packets and outputting AV data, and an AV encoder for encoding the AV data and outputting second AV transport packets. In other words, according to claim 1, the data that is encoded by the AV encoded is the data that has been output by the decoder. In this regard, Applicants note that the Examiner has relied on the above-noted disclosure at col. 10, lines 4-13 of Abecassis as disclosing the claimed "AV encoder" (see Office Action at page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, Applicants note that while Abecassis discloses the ability to replace frames having explicit bloodshed, for example, with additional frames that do not include explicit bloodshed (see Figs. 3A-3C), and that the additional frames will cause some frames to be non-sequentially placed in the variable content program (see Fig. 3D), that such disclosure does not in any way whatsoever indicate that AV data which has been output by a decoder is encoded by an AV encoder.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose, suggest or

9

otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in claim 1 of an AV decoder for decoding the first AV transport packets and <u>outputting AV data</u>, and an AV encoder for <u>encoding the AV data</u> and outputting second AV transport packets.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Abecassis, an indication of which is kindly requested.

<u>If the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1, in order for Applicants to be able to make an informed decision with regard to appeal, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explicitly identify the elements in Abecassis that are being relied upon as allegedly corresponding to the claimed "AV decoder" and the claimed "AV encoder".</u>

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 also recites the features of a <u>multiplexer</u> for multiplexing the <u>second AV transport packets</u> and the <u>second data table packets</u>, and outputting the multiplexed second AV transport packets and second data table packets in a second packet stream, wherein the <u>second data table packets contain parental control information</u>.

In other words, according to claim 1, the multiplexer multiplexes the packets output by the AV encoder (i.e., "the second AV transport packets") and the packets that include parental control information (i.e., "the second data table packets"). Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose or suggest such features.

In this regard, Applicants note that in the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that Abecassis discloses the above-noted features of claim 1 at col. 9, lines 16-31 and col. 10, lines 4-13 (see Office Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In particular, as described above, while the passages of Abecassis relied on by the

10

Examiner disclose the ability to replace frames having explicit bloodshed, for example, with additional frames that do not include explicit bloodshed (see Figs. 3A-3C), and that the additional frames will cause some frames to be non-sequentially placed in the variable content program (see Fig. 3D), Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose or in any way suggest the use of a multiplexer for multiplexing packets that are output by an AV encoder (i.e., "the second AV transport packets") and packets that contain parental control information (i.e., "the second data table packets").

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 1 of a multiplexer for multiplexing the second AV transport packets and the second data table packets, and outputting the multiplexed second AV transport packets and second data table packets in a second packet stream, wherein the second data table packets contain parental control information.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Abecassis, an indication of which is kindly requested.

If the Examiner maintains the rejection of claim 1, in order for Applicants to be able to make an informed decision with regard to appeal, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explicitly identify the element in Abecassis that is being relied upon as allegedly corresponding to the claimed "multiplexer", and to identify the data that is being relied upon as allegedly corresponding to the claimed "second AV transport packets" and the claimed "second data table packets".

11

Regarding claims 7-10, Applicants note that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim recites the features of decoding the first AV transport packets and outputting AV data; encoding the AV data and outputting second AV transport packets; and multiplexing the second AV transport packets and the second data table packets, and outputting the multiplexed second AV transport packets and second data table packets in a second packet stream, wherein the second data table packets contain parental control information.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over Abecassis, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 18-20 and 23-25 depend from claim 12 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 13, 21, 22, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (US 5,913,013) in view of DeCarmo (US 6,567,979).

Claims 2, 21 and 22 depend from claim 1, and claims 13, 26 and 27 depend from claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that DeCarmo does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of

Abecassis, with respect to claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2, 13, 21, 22, 26 and 27 are patentable over the cited prior art.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kojiro KAWASAKI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
By: 2009.09.09 23:36:50 -04'00'

Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krg
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 9, 2009